Page 1 of 2

1 2. How could Defendant represent that it "reasonably accommodated Plaintiff]'s 2 disability]," by "allow[ing] to work from home whenever she felt she needed to," (see Dkt. No. 39 at 19–20), when Ms. Lamb has since testified that Plaintiff's request to 3 4 work from home was denied, (see Dkt. No. 84-1 at 16–17). 5 Defendant's response shall be no more than 2,100 words in length, and shall be filed on or before July 2, 2025. Plaintiff will not file a reply brief unless otherwise requested by the 6 7 Court. 8 The clerk is ordered to re-note Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration July 2, 2025, and to 9 provide copies of this order to all counsel. 10 Dated June 25, 2025. Marshy Melina 11 12 Marsha J. Pechman United States Senior District Judge 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24